

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2011

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357  
Application Number: 10/578,872

-1-

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AMENDMENT AND REMARKS

FOR

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357  
Client Reference Number: 287846US  
Title: System to provide markers to affect rendering and navigation of content on demand  
Application Number: 10/578,872  
Filing Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2007

---

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS or facsimile to the USPTO (number 571-273-8300) or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

3/07/11  
Date

/Charles A. Mirho/  
NAME Charles A. Mirho

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357  
Application Number: 10/578,872

-2-

### Summary of Office Action

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent 5,721,829 to Dunn et al (hereafter referenced as Dunn) in view of US Patent 5,790,173 to Strauss et al (hereafter referenced as Strauss). Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent 7,055,166 to Logan et al (hereafter referenced as Logan) in view of US PG Pub 2008/0022296 to Iggulden (hereafter referenced as Iggulden). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dunn in view of Strauss as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,115,057 to Kwoh et al (hereafter referenced as Kwoh). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Iggulden as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Kwoh. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Iggulden as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of US PG Pub 2003/0188316 to DePrez (hereafter referenced as DePrez). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Iggulden and DePrez as applied to claim 11-15 above, and further in view of Kwoh.